

**To:** Skadowski, Suzanne[Skadowski.Suzanne@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Montgomery, Michael[Montgomery.Michael@epa.gov]  
**From:** Albright, David  
**Sent:** Wed 1/28/2015 8:09:32 PM  
**Subject:** RE: question about DOGGR spreadsheet we just sent to SF Chron

There is no discrepancy. On the "data" tab there are 171 wells between row 2 and row 189 injecting into sub-3000 aquifers (some rows were removed and put into tab 3 b/c the wells are not injecting). The "43 well" tab contains 5 wells that are sub-3000 giving the total of 176. Similarly, there are 253 wells in tab 2 that are injecting into aquifers between 3,000 and 10,000 ppm TDS and there are 26 wells in tab 3 that were permitted to inject into 3-10,000 range aquifers, but they have never injected. Total of wells in 3,000 – 10,000 ppm aquifers is 253+26 = 279.

Hope this helps.

David

**From:** Skadowski, Suzanne  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 28, 2015 11:51 AM  
**To:** Albright, David  
**Cc:** Montgomery, Michael  
**Subject:** RE: question about DOGGR spreadsheet we just sent to SF Chron

Help, please. Thanks!

---

**Suzanne Skadowski**  
Public Affairs Specialist  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | San Francisco  
**D:** 415-972-3165 | **C:** 415-265-2863 | **E:** [skadowski.suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:skadowski.suzanne@epa.gov)

**From:** Baker, David [<mailto:DBaker@sfchronicle.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 28, 2015 11:28 AM  
**To:** Skadowski, Suzanne  
**Subject:** RE: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle

Excellent. Many thanks. Glad to have up-to-date data.

I do notice a discrepancy between the tabs in this spreadsheet, the one you just sent. The first tab, which summarizes the data, says there are 176 wells injecting into aquifers below 3,000 TDS. But if you go to the second tab — the well-by-well data itself — there are 188 wells below 3,000 TDS. The first is row 2 and the last is row 189.

Similarly, the number of wells between 3,000 TDS and 10,000 TDS is 272 in the data, as opposed to 279 on the summary tab.

Was that summary tab somehow left over from an earlier iteration of the spreadsheet?

## David R. Baker

Staff Writer

Office 415.777.8400 • Cell 415.298.1764

[dbaker@sfgate.com](mailto:dbaker@sfgate.com) • @DavidBakerSF

San Francisco Chronicle | SFGATE

---

**From:** Skadowski, Suzanne [<mailto:Skadowski.Suzanne@epa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 28, 2015 10:47 AM  
**To:** Baker, David  
**Subject:** RE: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle

Hi David,

Per our call this morning, attached is the updated wells spreadsheet that DOGGR provided to EPA on Jan. 22. Thanks.

---

**Suzanne Skadowski**  
Public Affairs Specialist  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | San Francisco  
D: 415-972-3165 | C: 415-265-2863 | E: [skadowski.suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:skadowski.suzanne@epa.gov)

**From:** Baker, David [<mailto:DBaker@sfchronicle.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 28, 2015 10:17 AM  
**To:** Skadowski, Suzanne  
**Subject:** RE: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle

Sounds good. I'll be here.

## David R. Baker

Staff Writer

Office 415.777.8400 • Cell 415.298.1764

[dbaker@sfchronicle.com](mailto:dbaker@sfchronicle.com) • @DavidBakerSF

San Francisco Chronicle | SFGATE

---

**From:** Skadowski, Suzanne [<mailto:Skadowski.Suzanne@epa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 28, 2015 10:15 AM  
**To:** Baker, David  
**Subject:** Re: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle

In about 15 min from now - if that's ok?

---

**Suzanne Skadowski**  
Public Affairs Specialist  
U.S. EPA Region 9 | San Francisco  
D: 415-972-3165 | C: 415-265-2863 | E: [skadowski.suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:skadowski.suzanne@epa.gov)

On Jan 28, 2015, at 10:14 AM, Baker, David <[DBaker@sfchronicle.com](mailto:DBaker@sfchronicle.com)> wrote:

I am indeed. Let me know a time, and I'll be here.

## David R. Baker

Staff Writer

Office 415.777.8400 • Cell 415.298.1764

[dbaker@sfchronicle.com](mailto:dbaker@sfchronicle.com) • @DavidBakerSF

<image001.gif>

---

**From:** Skadowski, Suzanne [<mailto:Skadowski.Suzanne@epa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 28, 2015 10:07 AM  
**To:** Baker, David  
**Subject:** Re: a couple of data questions from the San Francisco Chronicle

Hi David, are you available for a call this morning, between now and 11am?

---

**Suzanne Skadowski**  
Public Affairs Specialist  
U.S. EPA Region 9 | San Francisco  
**D:** 415-972-3165 | **C:** 415-265-2863 | **E:** [skadowski.suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:skadowski.suzanne@epa.gov)

On Jan 27, 2015, at 2:08 PM, Baker, David <[DBaker@sfchronicle.com](mailto:DBaker@sfchronicle.com)> wrote:

These are from Don Drysdale, spokesman for DOGGR.

1. The list of 532 wells was queried from the database

last August. The list of 108 wells injecting into the 11 aquifers was queried more recently. Of those 108 wells, 94 are on the 532 list. The 14 wells not in that list are either:

- a. Injecting or proposed to inject into non-USDWs (TDS >10,000 based on latest information), hence the question of exemption is moot.
  - b. Not disposal wells – the 532 list were all disposal wells. The 108 list included enhanced oil recovery wells also.
  - c. Permits held in abeyance or cancelled. Some well statuses have not been updated yet, which is why these still turned up in the recent query of 108 wells.
- 
2. DOGGR submitted an initial list of 147 wells injecting into sub-3,000 TDS aquifers to the Water Board.